India

FOR THE

No. 51. New Series.]
No. 145. Old Series.]
WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1898.
[Registered as a Newspaper.
Price...... 2d.
By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 325
India and the Liberal "Imperialists" 328
"Almost Grotesquely Absurd" ... 329
Missionary Enterprise in India, by Alfred Webb 330
The Masnavi... 331
Chronicle of the Week 332
Letter to the Editor: A Warning from 1859 332
British Indians in the Transvaal: Official Notice regarding Locations 333
Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji in Lancashire: Meeting at Oldham 333
Lord Curzon and the Manchester Chamber of Commerce 334
Pathological Experiments in India 334
Public Meetings on Indian Questions: The Work of the British Committee 335
Advertisements 336

NOTES AND NEWS.

IT is with deep regret that we have to record the death of the Mahárájá of Darbhanga, who passed away on Friday last at the early age of 42. The Indian National Congress had no warmer, more generous, or more consistent supporter, though indifferent health, strict religious observances, and the necessity imposed upon him as a great landlord of avoiding an open breach with the authorities prevented him from taking so active a part in the movement as he wished. He was a most kindly, courteous, and modest man, of good abilities, and great though unostentatious independence of character. A strictly religious Hindu of the Hindus, he was devoid as well of bigotry as of spiritual pride. His charities were unstinted, his life was pure, and though he sometimes looked with suspicion upon the rights of tenants, and strongly opposed the Landlord and Tenant Act of 1885, his generosity as a landlord was great. He was not less loyal to the British Government than alive to the many defects of existing methods of administration. In the past fifty years no great noble has died who more truly loved India or had the welfare of her people more deeply at heart. Nothing but the deadly disease that has preyed on him for many years, and has now carried him off, prevented the realisation of the large schemes for the good of his countrymen which claimed so much of his thought.

Mr. Romesh Dutt writes:—"Among all the patriotic, public-spirited, and respected chiefs of modern India, there was none more public-spirited and more patriotic than Sir Lachmeswar Singh. Educated by English teachers he spoke that language perfectly, and those who have heard him voice the opinions of his countrymen in the Bengal Legislative Council, or in the Legislative Council of the Viceroy, have been struck alike by his manly and straightforward eloquence, his loyalty to the British Government, and his unalterable determination to be true to his country and his countrymen. There has been backsliding among other leading men in Bengal; there has been abandonment of the public interest for private or class interests; there has been betrayal of the country's cause for selfish motives. But the Mahárájá of Darbhanga's record is spotless, his honour and fame have been above suspicion. He has remained true to his country when other men turned their backs or changed their coats; he remained true to his honour when others withdrew and fled. He was the Bayard amidst Bengal zemindars, the knight without fear and without reproach. As a landlord his conduct towards his cultivators has been often favourably noticed by the Government of the day. In the Bengal famine of 1874 he is said to have spent £300,000 in relief of distress. In the famine of 1897 his remissions and contributions exceeded £100,000. The total gifts of this princely chief to public uses, it is said, amounted to something like two millions sterling.

"As a patriot he rendered liberal help to the great organisation of his educated countrymen, the National Congress. The Mahárájá of Darbhanga feared no living man and courted favour from none; and when he considered it his duty to help his educated countrymen in organising means to express their views on public measures, he rendered them help which will live in the grateful recollection of the people of India. It is remarkable that the fearless conduct of this great nobleman never did him any harm in the estimation of the rulers of the land. His honesty was so clear, his patriotism was so unquestioned that the highest rulers felt for him more respect and showed him more courtesy than they rendered to those who were more obsequious, more self-seeking, more disposed to trim their sails according to the direction of the wind. I have often seen the late Mahárájá in company with the highest European officials in Bengal, and I noticed with gratification the high respect which was invariably paid to him. It was my good fortune to be a member of the Bengal Legislative Council four years ago when he was also a member. He was so ill then that it was with some difficulty he walked up the steps to the council room, and he was sometimes permitted to speak sitting. His regard for his country's interests dragged him to the Council on important occasions, even in this state of health, and I never heard him speak—even when he was voting against me—without feeling the highest respect for his straightforward and manly candour, his loyalty to the Government, and his truth to his country."

The *Times* of Monday last gave the following obituary notice:—

The Mahárájá was always a loyal supporter of the Government, and exercised great influence over the whole Hindu population of Behar, the local Brahmins regarding him as their spiritual head. He was acknowledged also as chief among the landed aristocracy of Bengal, whose interests he represented on the Viceroy's Legislative Council. He adopted a generous policy towards his tenants during the late famine, granting relief freely and remitting or suspending many lakhs of his revenue. Mahárájá Sir Lachmeswar Singh, K.C.I.E., of Darbhanga, was a Mahárájá of the Bengal type—that is to say, not a reigning prince, but only a Zemindar, or a large landed proprietor. He was born in 1856, and succeeded to the hereditary estates in 1860. During his minority he was under the guardianship of the Court of Wards, and his education was superintended by an English tutor. Though he always wore the Native dress and was a strict observer of Hindu religious customs, he spoke English like an Englishman, and mixed a great deal in Anglo-Indian society. While taking a certain interest in horse-racing and other sports, his time was chiefly devoted to the administration of his vast estates, on which he spent enormous sums, not only for improvements, but also for charitable and educational purposes. On the occasion of the Queen's Jubilee in 1887 he was made a Knight Commander of the Indian Empire.

We have on more than one occasion sounded a note of warning as to an impending movement towards Tibet, and only regret that we have not room to reproduce in full an article in which the Calcutta *Englishman*, fortified by one Major Waddell, commends the project "to the earnest consideration of all who have at heart the welfare of the Empire." The article, which appeared on November 29, could not we think be easily beaten as a perfectly immoral plea for a piece of grab. Of course no attempt is made to deal seriously with the matter, but there is a more than usually cynical employment of phrases about "our prestige," "a bold policy," and "letting slip golden opportunities." One might dismiss the screed with the remark that the writer should be seen by two doctors if it were not that enterprises no less monstrous than that which is proposed have already been, undertaken by ambitious soldiers heedless of remonstrances from impotent taxpayers. Some of Lord Curzon's "greatest admirers" and worst enemies are understood to hope that he may help the scheme. It behoves "all who have at heart the welfare of the Empire" to prevent him.

Mr. Goldwin Smith's admirable letter on "Cobdenism" in Thursday's *Times* contained an interesting reference to India:—"We [that is Cobden's school and circle] might have had no difficulty in adopting the phrase 'greater Britain' if we could have persuaded ourselves that two hundred millions of Hindus were Britons, and that the real and permanent centre of British greatness lay, as the new Viceroy of India seems to think, in the land where no British child can be reared. As it was, we held that the

greatness of England lay in herself." A view, we fancy, for which there is much to be said. Mr. Goldwin Smith and his friends, it is to be feared, did not sufficiently perceive that greatness means bigness.

"We are bound together," said Dr. Fairbairn in his first speech in Bombay, "by a bond greater than any man or any single generation. Providence has bound us together. India and England are not two but one." Examine these excellent maxims in the light of England's deeds in India during the last twelve months, and what does one find? England has withdrawn the liberty of the Press which India enjoyed for more than fifty years. England has prosecuted Mr. Tilak in panic and kept the Natu brothers in durance without trial. England is now withdrawing the rights of local self-government which India has exercised for a generation. We do not doubt that Dr. Fairbairn spoke with perfect sincerity when he said "India and England are not two but one." But some unbrotherly and un-Christian acts in India will have to be undone before Indians can be got to assent to the proposition.

The Indian journals are still full of Sir John Woodburn's speech on the Calcutta Municipal Bill. On his remark that the contemplated changes must be annoying to the elected Commissioners, the *Indian Nation* observes:—

> The present elected Commissioners will not remain Commissioners for ever. In a very short time after the passing of the Bill their term will expire, and they will know whether or not to offer themselves for re-election under the present system. Their "annoyance," their personal humiliation, will be only temporary. If they resign their seats as soon as the Bill is passed, they avoid humiliation altogether. But the new law threatens the peace, the comfort, the property of all ratepayers, and threatens the poorest the most. There has been, therefore, a most acute alarm among the Native population.

This we believe to be the exact truth. There is a feeling of alarm and unrest among the Native population of Calcutta. Yet so little are our civilian administrators in touch with the people that they are not apparently conscious of the popular feeling. They ignore popular sentiment, and persist in withdrawing rights which the people have enjoyed for 22 years. They seek to rule Calcutta by despotic methods and to abolish the representative method. Is it thus that empires are consolidated?

The Municipal Bill is now before the Select Committee of the Bengal Legislative Council. A request has been made to the Bengal Government for permission to send a reporter to take notes of the proceedings. Here is the reply:—

> The meetings of Select Committees are not open to the public, and it would not be convenient to permit notes to be taken of their proceedings. Such amendments as the Select Committee may decide to recommend will be incorporated in the Bill for presentation to the Council; and the public will then have ample opportunity for considering them.

Technically no doubt the Bengal Government is right. But in view of the unrest and alarm excited by the Bill a report of the proceedings of the Committee would have been valuable.

Lord Elgin's tour in Burma, which has given rise to so many protests, has now come to an end amid the platitudes and fulsome speeches with which it began and continued. Of course the Viceroy took every occasion of advertising the great things accomplished, the roads, the railways, the telegraphs and the general prosperity, but the *Champion* may well ask if Upper Burma is really prosperous seeing that on an average one and a half crores a year have to be taken from the old province—itself none too rich—in order to supply the needs of the new. In his reply to the Mandalay address Lord Elgin promised to let Lord Dufferin also enjoy the great felicity of hearing its sentiments, on which the *Champion* remarks:—

> One would have thought, bearing in mind that unrighteous seizure, which can never be justified by the light of stern political ethics, that Lord Dufferin would have been the last person whose name should have been conjured in the matter. . . . History will not fail to record how a mighty and civilised Christian Government, egged on by a selfish and interested trading community, forcibly seized an old and historic kingdom, without any justifiable cause or provocation, and how it carried on the extirpation of patriotic men who tried to defend their country, by hunting them down under the pretext that they were dacoits.

But in this case, as often in our glorious Empire, the way of iniquity was the road to honour.

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* complains that in spite of the loss of life in the so-called Ghatal riot when several men were shot down by the police, the Bengal Government has never published any official version of the affair. It will be remembered that the rioters were in the end acquitted; but the conduct of the police has received no further investigation, although Mr. Mackertich, the magistrate, was of opinion that what purported to be the first police report of the affair was not written till after the second, the date having been changed. Nor did the two reports tally; and to say the least there was gross exaggeration. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* continues:—

> Let us summarise the above: (1) The Sub-Inspector stated on oath that he had written the First Information Report on May 8, before submitting his Report under Section 107, Cr. P. C. It transpired, however, that not only he did it not, but he had deliberately changed the date from May 9 to 8. (2) The object of his so doing was to aggravate the offence of the accused. (3) There were entries and alterations in the documents which were found to be deliberately made for the purpose of incriminating the accused. (4) The Police Inspector made statements on oath which were not considered true by the court.

Yet neither of these officials has been prosecuted.

Some little time back the deputy registrar of the Bombay High Court and a solicitor were sued for money which had come into their possession as receivers and which they had misappropriated. Mr. Justice Strachey characterised their conduct in strong terms, but it is said at the request of the plaintiff they were allowed time to refund. When the time expired it was discovered that they had both fled; and it is thought that the court should have at least been able to prevent such a scandal as the flight of one of its own officers who had already been treated with exceptional leniency. The High Courts have gained so splendid a reputation throughout India that the default of even a minor official comes as an unpleasant shock to the public; it is felt that everyone connected with these Courts should be above suspicion. The *Champion* draws attention to the silence which the Anglo-Indian journals have kept on the matter, and asks if the same silence would have been maintained had the fugitives been Indians instead of Europeans.

However great may be the qualities of Mr. Justice Strachey, whether considered as a man or a lawyer, it can hardly be doubted that his elevation to the position of Chief Justice of the High Court of the North-Western Provinces has been viewed with considerable regret. The High Courts hold a great place in the imagination of the people, a place which they have won especially by the firmness with which they have controlled the decisions of the inferior magistracy. To the Indians they represent justice in its highest form; and the confidence they inspire is at once an honour to British rule and a guarantee of its stability. Now Mr. Justice Strachey is best known for a decision in a political case which aroused a lively resentment throughout the country. Mr. Tilak, the prisoner whom he then sentenced, has become as a consequence a national hero, loved and honoured all over India. It cannot indeed be contended that an incompetent man should be appointed because the one competent man had rendered himself unpopular; but if, as seems certain, other certainly no less competent men could have been found, his connexion with what seems to Indians so dark a page in their history should surely militate against the desirability of his appointment. The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* hopes that he will now try to recover the favourable opinion of the Indians, and so good may come from evil. But it is unfortunate that he should have been chosen for this great promotion.

A case of some importance has been decided by the High Court of Bombay. In 1896 Mr. R. P. Karkaria, B.A., opened a college and obtained from the University the requisite sanction to send up students to the "previous examination" for three years from 1897. The Government however omitted this college from the list of colleges recognised by it in its resolution of May 28 last, and when students applied for admission to the "previous examination" they were refused. They appealed to the High Court against the refusal, and the Court decided in their favour on November 23, holding that under Section 12 of the charter no authorisation from Government was necessary. This must have been news to the ardent spirits who have been busy for the last two years bringing all self-

governing bodies in India under the despotic control of the Government.

Our readers may remember that a sub-deputy magistrate, Mr. Augier, was lately sentenced to six months' imprisonment for the detention of a Brahmin girl who was about to be deported to Assam as a coolie. Part of Mr. Augier's statement quoted in the Indian ournals throws some light on the recruitment of coolies for the tea-gardens:—

Laing had told him about a month before that there was a girl, called Deoki, in the depot, who was a Brahmin, and he would neither send her to Assam nor send her home. As she was a Brahmin and a minor and he did not like to send her back to her people *as it would be a dead loss to him*, accused told him to at once inform the Deputy Commissioner about it. Two or three days after they again met, and in the course of a conversation Mr. Laing informed accused that *he had induced Deoki to select a husband from among the young coolies* in his depot and that they were actually living together as man and wife. Accused told him it was very silly of him to tell him these things, and that he hoped there were not many Englishmen in India who would pimp for coolies.

The italics are ours. Much has been said, quite rightly, about slavery and forced labour in South Africa. Yet the law which the Hon. Kristo Das Pal characterised as "slave law" in the Bengal Legislative Council is still in force in India for the benefit of European tea-planters, and not a finger is raised by responsible statesmen to abolish it.

Mr. N. N. Bannerjee, Assistant-Director of Agriculture in Bengal, in a recent monograph on cotton fabrics, makes some interesting remarks on the *charki* or hand-loom:—

It does not seem possible that expensive machines should replace the ordinary *charki*, which is worked at practically no cost whatever by the women of the household, but it does seem possible to have some small inexpensive machines which will work on the same principle as the *charki* and give an increased outturn without injuring the quality of the cotton. Some contrivance is also needed which will enable the weavers to produce better cloths at a smaller cost and in a shorter time. . . . . Some simple mechanical contrivance may usefully take the place of hand-looms. In the absence of machinery, some improvements may be effected in the hand-loom itself and in the mode of arranging it. The improved looms of Serampore, which are to be found in a few other places, may usefully be largely introduced in different parts of these Provinces for the manufacture of the coarser kinds of fabrics. The improved method of setting up the work in Serampore may also be well introduced elsewhere.

Commenting on these remarks the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* says:—

We have a positive knowledge that a body of young, educated and energetic Bengalee gentlemen have already anticipated Mr. Bannerjee in his suggestion, and have been able to turn out *atpourai* cloths (*i.e.*, cloths for every-day use) which are being sold at the same price as foreign ones, and have been declared by many as fine as and more durable than the latter. And what is more, the demand for such cloths has been so large and pressing that the manufacturers have scarcely been able to meet it. To make this patriotic enterprise a greater success, capital is necessary; and we do not know of a better investment of money than this.

We wish the new industry all success. In order to succeed the promoters must, of course, depend not only on patriotism but also on good business methods. Capital will no doubt be forthcoming if the public are convinced that the business is in experienced and capable hands.

Mr. Chandravarkar stands forward as the latest Hindu advocate of social reform on the Bombay side of India, adding his own to the renowned names of Telang and Maudlik, Bhandarkar and Ranade. In three able articles contributed to the *Times of India*, Mr. Chandravarkar surveys the present position and says that what is wanted is not "revival" but "reform." He believes that the new Samajas are destined to prove the salvation of India. Different reformers think differently, and some are more radical than others. But we have no doubt that both "revival" and "reform" tend ultimately in the same direction, like the two wings of a vast army separated from each other by miles, and not comprehending each other's movements but both making towards the common goal. In this connexion it may be interesting to quote from the *Lahore Tribune* a passage from the speech of his Highness the Mahárájá of Patiala in reply to congratulations on his well-earned decoration:—

As for myself, I assure you of my sympathy with the aims and objects of the scheme of the Technical Institute proposed by the Hindus of the Punjab, and I shall be very glad to do what little I can to further this cause. Our Gurus, as you have truly said, sacrificed their very lives for the sake of the Hindus in time of need. Shall we, then, the devoted disciples of the Gurus, not try to follow the same path and to do what we can to help them? I see that efforts have of late been made in certain quarters to show that the Sikhs are not the Hindus. But this is a mistake. The Sikhs as a body have never considered, and can never consider, themselves as apart from the Hindus. They are not less Hindus than the Hindus themselves. They have a common cause. Let them be united together, and loyally serve their common sovereign and common country.

To "divide and rule" is a policy which some would lay down for India; but it could succeed only with the base and the self-seeking.

The readers of INDIA may remember the excitement caused by Mr. Goodridge's exposure of the inadequacy of famine relief in the Central Provinces. He contended that there were ample warnings of the approach of famine, that these warnings were neglected till emaciated persons began to wander and a heavy mortality had already begun, and that the measures which were at last taken were inadequate and unsuitable; nor is it denied that his intervention and the controversy it aroused had the effect of stimulating the authorities to new exertions. But of course his original facts were denied and the intensity of the famine was not admitted. Now we have in the sanitary inspector's report the fullest confirmation of Mr. Goodridge's allegations. In 1897 the births were only 254,973, less by 94,8[illegible] than the average for the three preceding years. But the rise of the death-rate was even more startling; for the deaths were 658,822, the triennial average being 321,962; so that there was an increase in the death-rate of 104 per cent. It is true that the sanitary inspector tries to attribute a part of this mortality to cholera and fever, but the deaths from those diseases throughout India as a whole were very low in 1897, and no evidence has been put forward to show that the Central Provinces were in this matter exceptional. This terrible mortality in the Central Provinces is one of the facts which must be taken into account when we have to listen to the self-glorification of the Indian Government for their success in dealing with the great famine.

It may be of interest to quote the following passage from a letter recently received from a learned and pious Brahmin:—"India has unfortunately been afflicted by earthquake, famine and the plague, and to crown all by the suspicion and distrust born of ignorance and weakness on the part of some self-centred and self-conceited officers who are not in touch with the people. Our people hold rightly or wrongly a firm belief in the theory that *yathá Rájá tátha prajá*, *i.e.* 'as a ruler is so are the ruled.' 'If the rulers are good the ruled are sure to be good.' The cause of the subjects being good or bad is the ruler, *Rájá*. The poet has truly said:—

> I believe there lives
> No man who truly loves and truly rules
> His following, but can keep his followers true;
> Traitors are rarely bred save under traitor kings.

Providence brings forth good out of evil; and it is hoped some good will come out of the numerous troubles that have afflicted this country. The sympathy, trust and magnanimity of the British Government in India will have had more effect in the minds of good men than many examples of severity."

The London Indian Society announces that "the annual Conference of all Indians resident in the United Kingdom" will be held in Westminster Town Hall on Wednesday afternoon next. Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji will preside and will move the first resolution, which urges that "Indians should be allowed commissions and command in the Indian army in the same manner and through the same methods as are open to Englishmen, by competition and training and by promotion for distinguished ability and gallantry in the field." The second resolution, which will be moved by Mr. Romesh Dutt, "deplores all legislation restricting self-government in India, urges the Government to withdraw the Calcutta Municipal Bill now before the Bengal Council, and affirms the principle that the extension of popular rights and of trust and confidence in the people is the surest foundation of British rule in India." A third resolution, to be moved by Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal, condemns the new law of sedition. We shall publish next week reports both of this Conference and of the fourteenth Session of the Indian National Congress which opens at Madras on Monday under the presidency of Mr. Ananda Mohun Bose.

INDIA AND THE LIBERAL "IMPERIALISTS."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT'S resignation of the leadership of the Opposition in the House of Commons has provoked numerous explanations—some extravagant and many contradictory—but it seems to be admitted on all sides that his dislike of the blatant "Imperialism" manifested by some members of the party has been a main cause of the step which has so much disturbed the public mind. With the matter as seen from a party point of view INDIA has no concern, but as it raises questions of principle and policy vitally affecting the future of the Indian Empire, it is one to which it is necessary to refer. It has been evident for some time that a noisy section of the party wish the foreign and colonial policy of the Liberals to be a second-rate imitation of the jingoism professed by the more thoughtless Tories. It is much to the credit of Sir William Harcourt that at an age when men are naturally disinclined to weaken the ties they have already formed he should be willing to resign the position of a leader and go forth as an independent member to strive in the cause of righteousness and justice. Whatever other effects his resignation may have, it can scarcely fail to make all Liberals carefully consider their position in regard to the great questions of Imperial domination and the treatment of weaker races. "Principles not persons" has become the cry in some Liberal organs. It would be well if the Liberal party should take this opportunity of making clear what its principles are on Imperial questions—whether it is for aggression and oppression, unequal laws and arbitrary despotism, or whether it believes in respect for the right of others, the extension of self-government, and equal justice to all. An appeal is made to principles. What on these questions are the principles of the Liberal party?

It so happens that one of the leaders of that party, Mr. Asquith, had occasion to address a meeting at Birmingham so lately as last Friday, December 16, and one naturally turns to his speech to see what light it may throw on the attitude of himself and his colleagues. So far as words go the answer he gives is satisfactory enough. He said:

> We are no jingoes. (Cheers.) We repudiate that pinchbeck Imperialism which regards the whole world as its legitimate province—(hear, hear)—and which would flaunt its flag of challenge and defiance in the face of every Power in turn. We base the rule of Great Britain in India, in Egypt, or wherever we are exercising our supremacy over the population of another country and race, not upon brute force—(cheers)—nor upon the superiority of disciplined strength over the scattered resources and the untrained intelligence of undeveloped races. We base it upon the work which we do, upon the benefits which we confer, and, above all, upon that which is, or ought to be, the predominant purpose of our policy—upon the slow but, in course of time, effective association with those to whom we come in the character of strangers and conquerors in the task of working out for themselves a larger and a better political and social ideal.

But when one turns from these brave words to consider the conduct of the leaders of the Opposition on some of the questions that have arisen in regard to the government of the Empire, it is impossible not to be struck with a grave discrepancy. Mr. Asquith speaks of what is or ought to be the predominant purpose of Liberal policy—the "effective association" of the conquered with the conquerors in working out for themselves a better political and social ideal. But what have the leaders of the Opposition done to make this policy prevail? Is it for the increase of this "association" of the two races that such municipal liberties as now exist should be reduced? Is it to this end that the late Liberal Government tamely permitted its subordinates in India to snap their fingers at the Resolution of the House of Commons in favour of simultaneous examinations to the Indian Civil Service—a condoned defiance of the authority of Parliament which in the opinion of competent observers has done more than any other single incident of recent years to dishearten the best friends of British rule in India and aggravate the autocratic tendencies of a large section of Anglo-Indian officers? Does it bring India nearer a better political and social ideal that the liberty of the Press should be curtailed? Is it not a flagrant violation of the political ideals of the Liberal party that government should be carried on by the methods of the Bastille and the Russian police, and that citizens should be imprisoned without trial? Yet in these cases what help have Mr. Asquith and the other Liberal leaders given to India? At the worst they have run away, and at the best they have been silent. Then Mr. Asquith, after this "masterly inactivity" in the House of Commons, goes down to Birmingham to deliver himself of generalities on the benefits we confer on India, and what should be the predominant purposes of our policy.

The *Manchester Guardian*, which has long been honourably distinguished for its advocacy of a policy of justice and good faith, and which has always kept itself well-informed on the affairs of India and other British possessions beyond the seas, commented as follows on Mr. Asquith's speech:—

> Imperialism as depicted by Mr. Asquith has much to recommend it. Our government, he tells us, is not to rest upon brute force, but upon the work that we do, the benefits that we confer on subject peoples, and on our association of them with us, so far as may be possible, in the business of government. This is an admirable statement of principle; but look at the facts. Does the government of the Bechuana by Cape Colony or of the Matabele and Mashona by the Chartered Company rest on brute force or on benefits conferred? There can only be one answer; but it will be urged that these are petty exceptions to a broad rule. We do not question that much admirable work is done in the way of governing "subject races" by British officials. But it must also be admitted that there are some bad exceptions, and if these are tolerated by public opinion at home they will become the rule. Now the test for the Liberal Imperialist is this. Is he prepared to deal with the exceptions? Is he ready to fight against slavery and forced labour and land robbery? Will he work through the Colonial Office or through public opinion, as the case may require, against unwarranted aggression or against personal cruelty? Will he protest not once or twice but continually against the employment of arbitrary arrest in India? Will he recognise that the effort to "associate" the Natives with us in the work of government is not aptly illustrated by the suppression of municipal rights in some of their great cities? When we find this attitude habitually adopted by the mass of representative Liberals, then we shall recognise that there is a genuine "Liberal Imperialism," an Imperialism which would rather see the Empire remain within its present limits than extend it by violence or by fraud, and does not hesitate to apply the Liberal principle of equal justice as between white men and dark. At present we find many who subscribe to this in theory, but when a test case arises like that of the Bechuana we find few who will take the trouble to fight it through, and those we do not find among the men who talk much of our Imperial responsibilities. For this reason we think there has been a real divergence of tendency. It is not merely peace that is in question. Still less is it the minor question whether extension of territory is in itself desirable or the reverse. It is a question embracing these and many more—the question whether in dealing with its dependencies or with foreign nations a great nation is to consider the material interests, real or illusory, of the dominant race a just excuse for shirking duty, shutting its eyes to crime, or threatening the peace of all the world. These are the questions on which the Liberal party is called upon to make up its mind.

This is excellent and goes to the root of the matter. It is useless to glorify the Empire for the benefits it confers if at the same time no efforts are made to redress the wrongs which spring from it. It is useless to say "we are no jingoes" while every fresh aggression is condoned, or to cry out for the "association" of the two races in India while injustice to Indians is permitted to pass without protest. After his speech at Birmingham Mr. Asquith is bound in honour to do his best to translate his ideals into facts, to denounce every departure therefrom, and to work strenuously that the benefits of which he speaks may not be hidden by unjust legislation or administrative wrong. The traditions of the Liberals point them out as the natural guardians of popular liberties and racial equality. Is it too much to ask that Mr. Asquith and his colleagues may in future raise their voices in favour of the freedom of the Press and municipal self-government in India? He calls for the "association" of conquerors and conquered. Will he protest against the attacks on those educated Indians whom we have trained up to share our rule but whose hopes are now flouted by the Government of India? Will he at least condemn the arbitrary imprisonment of the Natus, that flagrant violation of all that the Liberals have claimed to hold most sacred? By his conduct in such matters the sincerity of his professions will be brought to the test and the honesty of his political conduct will be judged. It is to be hoped alike for himself and his party, for England and for India, that he will pursue the manly and honourable course which his words prescribe, and that he will not be wanting in the great work of making his principles prevail in the government of India.

But as Mr. Asquith talks so glibly of the benefits conferred on India by British rule, it would be interesting to know if he has formed a clear idea of what those benefits are, or of what there may be on the other side of the account. Does he include among the benefits conferred the terrible drain on the country to pay the interest on the debt, and the various home charges, and the other expenses of alien government and alien exploitation? Does he think that the material prosperity of a country in which the exports always vastly

exceed the imports can be on a sound basis? Does he look with equanimity on the ever increasing debt of India? And if not, what steps is he prepared to take to remedy these enormous evils? Again Mr. Asquith makes a great point of the "effective association" of the two races. Is he aware that, so far from this association increasing, it is and has now been for a considerable time diminishing? Is he aware that this separation of the two races, recognised and deplored by the best Anglo-Indians, is actually fostered by the policy of the Government—by the contempt expressed for educated Indians, and by the evident desire to decrease the share of the Indians in the administration of their own country? But if the co-operation of the two races is diminishing, the justification, according to Mr. Asquith, of our Imperial rule is also diminishing. The longer then our Empire lasts the further is its end and aim from accomplishment, so that its justification is seriously invalidated. It behoves the leaders of the Liberal party to gird up their loins and fight strenuously for their ideals. Otherwise they will some day awake from their long slumber and their dreams of Imperial beneficence to find that the glorious Empire they cherish has become a mere scramble for new markets, a camping ground for British officials, and a monstrous tyranny where flourish all the bad old methods of bygone despotism. They will awake to find the people of India reduced to a political and financial servitude which the gift of European education and the infusion of Western ideas have only made the more painfully apparent. This is very far from being the present state of the British Empire in India. But things have now for some years been moving in this direction. And if this retrograde policy should finally triumph none will deserve more blame than those who inheriting the traditions of Liberalism have defended the Empire as the source of benefits which they have had neither the strength nor the devotion to make sure that it confers.

"ALMOST GROTESQUELY ABSURD."

LORD SALISBURY'S interpretation of historical facts will not always allow one to be reticent. It may be indeed that he only intends by an indirect process to rebuke the general ignorance of bygone politics and of the significance of events. Without attempting to explore the real meaning of the twists he occasionally gives to history, let us reproduce a statement he is reported to have made last Friday at the Constitutional Club. Defending the House of Lords he said:—

They tell us that the House of Lords interferes with the judgments of the House of Commons, but what are the judgments of the House of Commons with which the House of Lords has interfered? I am speaking of first-class questions. It is curious that twice in our recent history—and by that I mean in the last two centuries—twice on great occasions the House of Lords intervened to veto the action of the House of Commons and to insist that the country should be consulted. The first occasion was the celebrated Fox's India Bill, of which *the object was to place the whole patronage of India in such hands that the House of Commons might be successfully and safely manipulated for the future.* That promising plan was negatived by the House of Lords and was rejected indignantly by the country. (Cheers.)

One wonders how many of those who cheered knew the circumstances of the case. Lord Salisbury's other awful example was of course Mr. Gladstone's memorable attempt to do tardy justice to Ireland. He could not have chosen instances more fit to illustrate the obstructiveness, the blindness, and the mischievousness of his clients the peers.

The episode of Fox's India Bill was carefully explained by Sir William Wedderburn in an article on "Edmund Burke and the Indian Bureaucracy" in the *Bombay Gazette* of March 5, 1884, which we reprinted in INDIA on July 22 last. That article is as fresh to-day as it was in 1884, and we beg to refer our readers to it. The question however raised by Lord Salisbury's misstatement is an historical one, and we wish to let historical facts and historians speak for us. The situation that called forth Fox's India Bill is thus described by the Right Hon. W. Massey in his "History of England under George III":—

The Company lay under accusation of having cruelly and scandalously abused the privileges of rulers. Their principal servants had been inculpated of gross malversation by a unanimous resolution of the House of Commons; and the Company had nevertheless upheld their officers in spite of the opinion of Parliament and of the Ministers of the Crown. The administration of justice had been so notoriously and scandalously abused that the Chief Justice had been dismissed, in spite of the Company, by the authority of the King's Government. Nor had the Company purchased material prosperity by the open violation of the principles on which civil government, nay, society itself is based. Plunder and extortion had only relieved their immediate and temporary exigencies. The ordinary resources of India were unequal to satisfy the greedy adventurers who were spread over the land, and to maintain the military force which was necessary to support an arbitrary and iniquitous Government. The Company therefore came before Parliament as delinquents who had grossly abused their trust, and as bankrupts unable to perform their engagements.

Now it is quite certain that whether the alleged facts were true or untrue all parties in the State at home equally accepted them as true. Fox, in consultation with Burke, proposed a remedy in his India Bill. As Sir William Wedderburn put it, "the power of control was to be taken from those who were the friends and nominees of the delinquents, and was to be placed in the hands of a strong and independent commission appointed by Parliament from among the most trusted men in England—men unconnected with Indian intrigues, and prepared to enforce publicly and with judicial impartiality the broad principles of justice and good government." Fox declared the broad purpose of the Bill in a noble speech on the motion for going into Committee (December 1, 1783), from which we must quote a passage:—

What (he asked) is the most odious species of tyranny? Precisely that which this Bill is meant to annihilate,—that a handful of men, free themselves, should execute the most base and abominable despotism over millions of their fellow-creatures; that innocence should be the victim of oppression; that industry should toil for rapine; that the harmless labourer should sweat, not for his own benefit, but for the luxury and rapacity of tyrannic depredation,—in a word, that thirty millions of men, gifted by Providence with the ordinary endowments of humanity, should groan under a system of despotism, unmatched in all the histories of the world. What is the end of all government? Certainly the happiness of the governed. Others may hold other opinions; but this is mine, and I proclaim it. What are we to think of a Government whose good fortune is supposed to spring from the calamities of its subjects, whose aggrandisement grows out of the miseries of mankind? This is the kind of government exercised under the East India Company, upon the natives of Hindustan, and the subversion of that infamous government is the main object of the Bill in question.

What then were the provisions of the Bill? Fox proposed to create a supreme council of a judicial character in England in place of the existing Courts of Directors and Proprietors. This council was to consist of seven commissioners who were to be named by the Legislature, who were to be irremovable for four years except upon an address from either House of Parliament, and who were to have absolute power to place or displace all persons in the service of the Company, and to order and administer the territories, revenues, and commerce of India. The measure was limited to four years, after which the nomination of the commissioners was to shift to the King, and even while the measure was in operation the King was to have the power of filling up any vacancies. A subordinate body of nine assistant-directors, chosen by the Legislature from among the largest proprietors and holding their seats for four years, was to be constituted for the management of the details of commerce, and the members were to be removable either by the King, upon an address of either House of Parliament, or by the concurrent proposal of five of the chief directors, while the proprietors were to fill vacancies. We might quote from Fox's correspondence to demonstrate the nobility of his motives and to present a remarkable parallel to the attitude of Mr. Gladstone a century later. "I know," he wrote, "I have done no more than I was bound to do in risking my power and that of my friends when the happiness of so many millions is at stake." It is enough for us however that Mr. Lecky acknowledges that "there is not a shadow of reason for doubting that their (Fox's and Burke's) motives in introducing the Bill were perfectly singleminded."

But what of the Opposition? On their side, says Mr. Lecky, "the interests of the Indian people do not seem to have weighed a feather in the scale." The outcry against the measure turned on two different points—points that touched not the interests of India but only personal and factious interests in England. "The main popular argument against the Bill," says Mr. Lecky, "was that it was intended to vest in the Whig party the whole patronage of India, to secure it to them when they had passed out of office, and thus to give them an amount of corrupt influence which would enable them to balance the influence of the Crown, defy succeeding administrations and control Parliament by their votes." Pitt denounced the Bill as "one of the boldest, most unprecedented, most desperate

and alarming attempts at the exercise of tyranny that ever disgraced the annals of this or any other country." Thurlow, with lawyer-like cunning, described it to the King as "a plan to take more than half the royal power and by that means disable the King for the rest of the reign." Can Lord Salisbury possibly believe in the reality of these denunciations? Let him ask the opinion of Mr. Lecky, who writes ("England in the Eighteenth Century," iv, 291):—

There are, as it appears to me, few things in the history of political exaggeration more extravagant than these assertions. . . . If the patronage and administration of India were to be vested in any elected body not chosen by the Proprietors, it is difficult to see what better course could have been adopted than to have followed the precedent of the Act of 1773 and entrusted the nomination to the Legislature. The provision making the Supreme Commissioners under ordinary circumstances irremovable for four years was consistent with the general rule of Indian appointments, and it was plainly necessary if any real reform was to be effected. The period, indeed, for which they were to be appointed was, as Burke truly said, even too short for the exigencies of the case, and considering the distance of India and the magnitude and complication of the abuses which had grown up in the last twenty years, it was probable that the first four years would be wholly occupied with laying the mere foundations of reform. The object of the Bill was to regulate the administration of India as far as possible on the principles of a Court of Judicature, and if, as most persons now agreed, it was necessary to place an absolute power over Indian administration in the hands either of a person or a council, it seemed safer to entrust it to a body in England under the eye of Parliament than to a governor or a council in India. It would, no doubt, have been better if the Government had divided its appointments between the two parties, or had selected men who were not identified with either; but it is very doubtful whether any English Government of the eighteenth century, in creating important offices in England, would have acted in such a manner, and the notion that it was possible for the new court to outweigh the influence of the Crown, to defy successive administrations, and to obtain through its patronage the ascendency in Parliament, seems to me almost grotesquely absurd. These dreaded Commissioners were only to hold their office for four years, and all vacancies were to be filled by the appointment of the Crown. They could be at any time removed by the King upon an address of either House of Parliament if they were found guilty of grave abuse of their powers, and no administration could exist in England which did not command a parliamentary majority. They were also obliged to perform all their duties under constant superintendence and control. . . . To suppose that a body so formed and so limited could have been a serious danger to the constitution, even if it had been actuated by the most malevolent intentions and had applied all its energies to English and not to Indian politics, appears to me absolutely extravagant.

Yet all these extravagances were actively circulated and did their work in the country. Still the Bill passed its final stages by majorities of 229 to 120, of 217 to 103, and of 208 to 102. But Temple and Thurlow engineered the Lords. Temple had a private audience with the King on December 11, and carried away with him a paper in the King's handwriting, authorising him "to say that whoever voted for the India Bill was not only not his friend, but would be considered by him as an enemy." Mr. Lecky tells vividly how the communication ran along the benches with instantaneous effect. "The bishops waver," wrote Fitzpatrick, "and the Thanes fly from us; in my opinion the Bill will not pass." On December 17 the Bill was rejected by 95 votes against 76. "We are beset in the House of Lords," wrote Fox with justifiable bitterness, "by such treachery on the part of the King, and such meanness on the part of his friends, as one could not expect either from him or them." Nor could one have expected that Lord Salisbury would lend even the appearance of approval to such contemptible strategy, and gravely repeat at the Constitutional Club, by way of establishing one of two crowning proofs of the disinterested wisdom of the House of Lords, a calumny which Mr. Lecky rightly stigmatises as "absolutely extravagant" and "almost grotesquely absurd."

MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE IN INDIA.

By Alfred Webb.

THINKERS on Indian affairs must often be impressed with the widespread and general interest amongst large classes of the community in missionary work, as contrasted with the general absence of interest in the wants and wishes of the Indian people as expressed by themselves. These kingdoms are netted with missionary societies that have no difficulty upon the shortest notice in gathering—whether at drawing-room meetings or in town halls—audiences prepared to be interested in missionary speakers who may never have been east of Suez. These missionary societies are recruited from all ranks of society, largely from connexions of official classes, who would believe themselves compromised if they listened to native Indian exponents of Indian questions. No duties come easier to average minds than the furtherance of plans to lead others to think as we do; nothing more flattering, more self-satisfying than to be assured that such plans are fruitful in result. Our favourable estimate of ourselves cannot but be confirmed as we view the engraving of an irreproachably dressed individual like ourselves, standing under a palm tree and surrounded by a crowd of "natives" scantily attired, eagerly drinking in *our* opinions. It is somewhat humiliating to realise the extent to which we must be spurred to philanthropic effort by the suggestion that we are thereby leading the recipients of our bounty to think as we do.

Yet to a rightly constituted mind the thought of a free man working out his own life should be more pleasing than of one in bondage to our ways of life and thought. In like manner should we not more accustom ourselves to taking pleasure in their holding their own opinions on religious questions, albeit they may be different from ours?

But, alas, we are so certain in our own beliefs—so confident in our capacity to think for other people and manage their affairs better than they know themselves! And what more tiresome, what more upon any excuse to be avoided, than listening to those likely to disturb our complacency? Those likely to soothe our minds cannot but be more acceptable than those who call upon us to exercise them.

There is much that is admirable and devoted in the missionary spirit. Pattesons and Livingstones and Backhouses are amongst the highest types of humanity. Who can fail to be touched with this spirit as we meet it in its purity, whether in the homes and work of missionaries at their posts of duty, or amongst their helpers at home, where little children deprive themselves of pleasures most dear for the benefit of those that they will never see?

There are, however, serious dangers attendant upon such enterprise, more especially where it is exercised by the persons of a governing nation. Missionary effort is not now what it was in past ages, or even in recent times, when men, laying aside all natural desires and taking their lives in their hands, sought to win others through self-abnegation and mild expostulation. Missionary life, at least among Protestants, has become a profession like any other. The young men and the young women who enter upon it are as likely as soon thereby to be enabled to marry and have homes of their own as the sisters and brothers who remain at home and enter upon business or adopt a profession. And there is in the corporate pride of celibate missionary enterprise perhaps as great temptation to material considerations as there is where marriage is allowed. Nothing is more insidious, more vigilantly to be guarded than material interests. It is the interest of the missionary to live comfortably; it is his duty to bring up his children well and give them the advantages of life. All depends upon the need for his exertions and the extent to which his exertions are successful. Upon the spot, investigating the outcome of long years of missionary work and comparing it with reports circulated at home, it at times is difficult to suppress the conviction that, to say the least, the best face has been put upon actual results. I have resided in countries where the native population was in process of rapid extinction through white greed and white vices, and have visited others where the natives had, because of treatment meted out by Christians, deliberately turned their backs on Christianity, and where once flourishing mission stations were in ruins. And yet how difficult would it have been to recognise in annual missionary reports the working out of such processes! Incentives to home support too often lead—doubtless unconsciously—to depreciation of the character, manners, and customs of the populations amongst which work is being carried on. The worse they are represented the greater is the call for missions, the more generous is likely to be the response to appeals for support. How impossible it may be to eradicate impressions concerning faults that are but hinted and dislikes that are conveyed by but hesitancy of utterance! And we are too prone to consider the sins to which our people and nation are inclined as but lightly affecting character, and those to which other peoples have a mind as indelibly vitiating

it. The continuity and civilisation of the Indian people could not have been maintained through the ages, would not be what it is to-day were it what it is too often represented to be in missionary reports. And in the case of India it is to be feared there is too often a double bias to depreciation. We know how nobly upon moral questions the missionaries generally bear themselves ahead of their official compatriots; but they too often partake of their leanings and prejudices. And one of the most powerful arguments with the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy in shutting out Natives from their just share of political favours and employments is steady depreciation of their character and steady misrepresentation of their wants and wishes.

By justice may we best hope to attract others to our opinions; injustice, misconception, hauteur, are the surest repellents. There is something mean in seeking by honied words to draw men to us, whilst behind their backs we call in question much that is dearest to them. Feeling is an essential portion of our lives. I have heard a lady returned from missionary work in India express opinions concerning the people of India, more especially educated Indians, that would close my mind against anything she might have to say upon spiritual questions. What then would likely be her success amongst Indians themselves?

Missionary work can be effective only in so far as it is carried on by those free of guile or mental reservations concerning those with whom they have to deal. Nothing more impossible in the long run than to conceal our real characters and motives and intentions. They will out. None more quick to discern than the poor and lowly. We have no warrant to obtrude our opinions upon others in their country in a manner different from that in which we would be willing they should obtrude theirs upon us in our country. And most care is needed where they are not in the position we are to guard themselves against undue zeal. We occasionally see noted in Indian papers doings which if matched by Hindu missionaries in these countries would lead to their expulsion.

Taking a broad view of our relations with India, missionaries must to some of us appear as if working with the short end of the lever. One outrage by a professing Christian upon Indian manhood, one debasement of Indian womanhood may for a time outweigh all the teachings of all Christian advocates. We glory in impudently forcing ourselves upon countries where we are not wanted. We pride ourselves upon colonies that exclude fellow-subjects to whom we have solemnly pledged equal rights with ourselves. Collectively rolling in a plethora of the good things of this life, we nicely balance or weigh in favour of ourselves accounts with a country where millions live upon the verge of starvation. As taxation is now arranged, the most generous reapportionment of accounts that would relieve countless homes in the East of most grievous burthens, would touch, and that but lightly, the fringe of our superfluities. And yet we expect general acceptance of assurances of our belief in the Divine obligation of the Sermon on the Mount!

As, especially at this season, we pass along the streets of even the poorest of our great cities, and mark on all hands evidences of superabounding comfort, must not our thoughts be drawn to millions of Indian homes, inhabited by those as quick to suffer, as keen to desire, as ourselves, where have to be spared even the grains of salt to season their innutritious food? Those "principles of finance" by adherence to which are sought to be justified present methods are simply the principles of the strong able to benefit themselves at the expense of the weak.

We are bound to respect even where we may not at all times be able to appreciate, missionary effort; but we cannot put from us the conviction that the most powerful agent in attracting men to Christian teaching is not Christian preaching but Christian justice.

THE MASNAVI.[1]

MR. WHINFIELD has fairly earned the gratitude of students of Oriental philosophy and religion by his abridged translation of, and introduction to, the Masnavi. The fact that his volume has reached a second edition is a welcome proof that it has already received the recognition which does not always attend such sound scholarship and unpretentious learning. The introduction is a model piece of writing. Every word is to the point. And yet, while all temptations to discursiveness are resisted, no instructive parallel, whether in Plato or Cardinal Newman, Origen or Bishop Butler, is passed without notice. Every sentence of the twelve pages into which Mr. Whinfield has compressed his "General View of the Masnavi," reveals the writer's breadth of reading and critical acumen; and not a sentence is written for the mere display of either.

The poet of the Masnavi was born at Balkh in 1207 A.D., but passed most of his life at Qonia, the Iconium of St. Paul, in the Roman province of Galatia. Hence he acquired the name of "Rumi" or "the Roman." He wrote his poem for the benefit of his disciples who were "Sufis," an esoteric sect of Mahometans with quasi-monastic institutions. Mr. Whinfield gives a brief but interesting account of the Sufis, with quotations from the more notable sayings of their teachers. They were indifferent to outward forms and rites. When Rabia made the pilgrimage and saw the Ka'ba, she said, "I see only bricks and a house of stone; what do they profit me? 'Tis thou that I want." They preached union with the Divine through self-mortification and meditation. "I saw the Truth," said another, "in a dream. He said to me, 'What dost thou desire?' I answered, 'I desire what thou desirest.' He said, 'I am to thee as thou to me.'" Again, "The true ecstatic Sufi is he who knows One person, and One person knows him." Again, "Whoso worships God by the light of ordinary religion is as one who seeks the sun by the light of the stars." In conformity with such doctrines, the Masnavi opens with "The song of the reed," figuring the love of the soul to God and its desire to be united with Him. Spiritual love is represented in the poem by what Mr. Whinfield calls "the perilous analogy" of earthly love. But he claims that Rumi avoids the worst excesses of some Christian mystics, that he is careful to point out the inadequacy of symbols derived from the world of sense, and that he draws his doctrine to some extent from the Platonists.

As Dante's great "Commedia" has been accorded the epithet "Divina" by the universal consent of Europe, so in India Masnavi's poem, written half a century earlier, has been called "I Ma'navi," "the Spiritual." It is not easy for the modern European reader to place himself in the right attitude of mind for appreciating its beauties. The Masnavi, with its 26,000 couplets, was written for readers who had unlimited time at their disposal. The modern reader, who is "the heir of all the ages" in literature, and who may well stagger beneath the weight of his inheritance when he realises its magnitude, finds no objection to a poem so fatal as prolixity. He can hardly be persuaded, for instance, to read "The Ring and the Book," which is not more than half the length of the Masnavi and has the advantage of a plot of thrilling interest. Again, allegorical interpretation is no longer in fashion. Rumi, who ascribed seven senses to each passage of the Koran, was only following a method familiar to all generations of Christian mystics and much in vogue with English poets in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; but the modern reader soon tires of it. The interest that the Masnavi possesses is, therefore, religious rather than literary. It proves that Mahometanism has not been without its idealists, and that their teaching has sometimes approximated with wonderful closeness to the teaching of the sincerest and loftiest "seekers after God" in Western communions. Religious partisans, of whatever creed, are apt to look with suspicion upon such discoveries and to minimise their importance. But that is surely a deeper, and not merely a broader, view of religion which hails with thankfulness signs of a Divine revelation in unexpected places, proofs of a Godhead "not far from every one of us." Some such conviction will probably be borne in upon the minds of all who study attentively the quaint stories and quainter moralisings of the Spiritual Couplets of Rumi, as they are here presented in Mr. Whinfield's version. It should be added that he has very considerably abridged the original to bring the whole within the compass of a single readable volume.

[1] "Masnavi I Ma'navi: The Spiritual Couplets of Rumi." Translated and abridged by E. H. Whinfield, M.A., late of Bengal Civil Service. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Co., Ltd.

Mr. Chamberlain has promised to preside at the dinner of the London School of Tropical Medicine, to be held at the Hotel Cecil on May 10.

Sir George Robertson left London on Thursday week to join the "Arabia" at Marseilles with Lord Curzon.

The Bishop of Calcutta (Dr. Welldon) has arranged to leave England for the scene of his new duties on January 11.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

Thursday, December 15.—Sir W. Harcourt, in reply to a request for an interview from the editor of a Welsh paper, said he had no intention of leaving the House of Commons, and hoped still, as an independent member of the House, to deserve the confidence of his constituents in West Monmouthshire. He did not feel that there would be any advantage for the present in his making any further statement than that already published.—Sir William, acknowledging an assurance of continued confidence from the West Monmouth Liberal Association, said the step he had thought it necessary to take was not adopted without regret, but it was one which the situation rendered indispensable.

Speaking at a banquet of the Anglo-Caucasian Oil Company, M. Tatistcheff, representative in London of the Russian Finance Ministry, spoke of the strong desire entertained in Russia for friendly relations with this country, and urged the advantages offered for the investment of British capital in Russia.

Lord Newton died at his seat near Stockport. He was in his 70th year. The succession to the title of his eldest son, the Hon. T. W. Legh, M.P., created a vacancy in the Parliamentary representation of the Newton division of Lancashire.

Lord Curzon of Kedleston, the new Viceroy of India, left Charing-Cross Station by the 11 a.m. train *en route* for Calcutta. A large number of private and political friends were present to bid the Viceroy good-bye.

It was stated that Sir Claude MacDonald had lodged a strong protest with the Tsung-li-Yamên against any extension of the French concession at Shanghai.

Friday, December 16.—The National Liberal Federation held the annual conference of its general committee at Birmingham. Dr. R. Spence Watson, president, occupied the chair, and after paying a warm tribute to Sir W. Harcourt's services, moved a resolution of regret and thanks to the right hon. gentleman. A proposal to add a request that Sir William would reconsider his position was rejected and the resolution carried. A resolution was subsequently agreed to welcoming the Tsar's proposals for a conference to prevent the increase of armaments. The motion from the South Nottinghamshire Liberal Association for taking into consideration the question of the party leadership was next brought forward, but after some discussion was withdrawn.

Mr. Asquith, speaking at a meeting in Birmingham, referred at length to Sir William Harcourt's letter resigning the leadership of the Liberal party. He deplored Sir William's retirement as sincerely as he had deplored Lord Rosebery's, and remained unconvinced on the present as on the former occasion of the necessity and expediency of the step that had been taken. Sir William's statement that he would not be a candidate for any contested position might be open to misconstruction. He considered that there was not and could not be any such competition. During Sir William Harcourt's leadership his colleagues and the rank and file of the party had given him their loyal support.

Lord Salisbury, speaking at the Constitutional Club, said that as to foreign affairs, he would urge their critics to consider their work as a whole. The danger of the hour was lest rhapsody should be made an adequate substitute for calculation. The Empire was advancing, and must continue to advance; the strength they possessed must be used prudently towards that advancement; and he claimed for the Government that they had used the forces which had been entrusted to them not sentimentally, but with calm and courageous calculation for the furtherance of the interests of the Empire and the benefit of mankind.

Saturday, December 17.—President M'Kinley, speaking at Savannah, said that after destroying the Spanish government in the Philippines, it was the duty of the United States to provide the islands with a better one. All that had been done by the American commanders and forces in the Philippines had been in the line of duty, and it was not less a duty to remain there and give the inhabitants protection and guidance, and a government which would secure them peace, order, and security in their life and property and the pursuit of happiness.

The British, American, German, and Japanese merchants in Shanghai were reported to be sending to their Ministers in Pekin identical protests against any extension of the French area of exclusive control in Shanghai. The British cruiser "Iphigenia" proceeded to Shanghai to-day. The Chinese were said to regard her arrival as an indication that the British Government would oppose the active enforcement of the French claims.

Sunday, December 18.—A meeting in support of the Tsar's proposal was held in St. James's-hall. The Archdeacon of London presided. Letters expressing general sympathy with the Tsar's object were read from Mr. Balfour, Lord Ripon, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. James Bryce, Sir H. Fowler, Mr. L. Courtney, Lord Spencer, Lord G. Hamilton, Mr. John Morley, and Lord Rosebery. A resolution was carried "heartily echoing" the Tsar's appeal on behalf of peace, and advocating the organisation of a national committee to "express the undoubted pacific aspirations of the English people."

Monday, December 19.—There were excited debates in the French Chamber arising out of further attempts to obtain disclosure of the secret *dossier* in the Dreyfus case. M. de Freycinet, in answer to the first interpellation, said he had communicated to the Court of Cassation all the documents in his possession consistent with the national defence; but he would communicate nothing which would imperil the safety of the State. He offered to resign his portfolio if the House did not approve of his attitude. Replying to a second interpellation, M. Dupuy said the secret *dossier* did contain documents which it would be detrimental to the safety of the State to divulge. The Government, therefore, must wait for the reply of the Court of Cassation concerning the guarantees to be given. If it were found impossible to furnish these guarantees, the Government would refuse to communicate the documents, and in so doing they were aware of the grave responsibility of the steps they were taking.

Prince George left Athens for Crete, on board the Royal yacht "Amphitrite." After a *Te Deum* had been sung at the Palace, the Prince left for the Piræus with members of his family. At the railway station he was met by representatives of the Diplomatic Corps and the Holy Synod, after having passed through enthusiastic crowds of the people. Preparations for the reception of Prince George at Crete were being made on a large scale, and in the decorations of the Cretan town the flags of the four Powers were said to be conspicuous.

It was stated that Major Marchand evacuated Fashoda and hauled down the French flag on December 11, and afterwards left for the river Sobat. Egyptian troops now occupied the fort, on which the British and Egyptian flags were hoisted.

Tuesday, December 20.—It was announced that Mr. Justice Hawkins had resigned his position as a Judge of the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court.

Mr. Gerald Balfour, speaking at Keighley, said the Liberal party was beset with distracted sections and conflicting interests; yet it continued, and there was such a thing as continuing to be Liberal, and even Radical, out of sheer conservatism. The most remarkable feature of the political life of the last fifteen years was the growth of the Imperial spirit, which was not confined to one party alone. As to the Irish Local Government Act, the Government had, in passing it, had the wit and courage to seize an opportunity, which might never recur, of settling a most difficult problem on lines distinct from the Home Rule plan. Home Rule would not die so long as Ireland sent eighty members to the House of Commons, and the Unionist party must not disarm or disband their forces.

Wednesday, December 21.—Prince George of Greece, the new High Commissioner of Crete, arrived at Suda Bay escorted by the flagships of the four Powers, and, after landing, proceeded to Canea amid enthusiastic manifestations of welcome from large crowds of people. The Prince attended at the church, where a *Te Deum* was sung, and then went on to the Government building, where he formally assumed his new duties. A correspondent at Canea laid stress on the perfectly orderly behaviour and pacific demeanour of the Cretans, and described the day's proceedings as most harmonious and successful.

Mr. Bryce, M.P., was the guest of the Anglo-African Writers' Club, and in acknowledging the toast of his health, pointed out some of the relations which literature and literary men ought to bear to the outlying parts of the Empire. Literary men could do one great thing for the colonies (and he included India in the colonies)—they should make people at home understand them. There still existed in England an ignorance of colonial society and of the conditions of colonial life, and he thought literature could remove that ignorance.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR.

A WARNING FROM 1859.

To the Editor of "India."

Sir,—A few days ago I bought a secondhand copy of a book, "A Treatise on Problems of *Maxima* and *Minima*, solved by Algebra, by Ramchandra, late Teacher of Science, Delhi College. Reprinted by order of the Honourable Court of Directors of the East India Company for circulation in Europe and in India, in acknowledgment of the merit of the author, and in testimony of the sense entertained of the importance of independent speculation as an instrument of national progress in India, under the superintendence of Augustus De Morgan, F.R.A.S., F.C.P.S., of Trinity College, Cambridge; Professor of Mathematics in University College, London, 1859." This copy was "Presented by the Secretary of State for India to the Dean of Ely." It also contains a letter by Professor De Morgan to the Dean of Ely which throws a curious light on the treatment of Indians by Englishmen, and contains also De Morgan's opinion on the point. That letter is as follows:—

7, Camden Street, N.W.,
July 7, 1859.

My dear Sir,—I am much obliged by your kind note, and gratified by your approval of my Indian doings. . . . Had I been publishing independently of Government, I should perhaps have added what

Ramchandra meant me to add—as I judge by his mode of telling it—that he had been beaten in the public road by a man in a British uniform for not making a *salaam* as he passed. We talk a great deal about the ways and means of preserving India; but few know that this treatment of educated and civilised Natives is always going on. We are constantly sending out to India a parcel of boobies who have no idea of the people they have to govern, and who will, each one of them, make a few hundred malcontents among educated men who are reverenced by the mass of the people. And now we are mending matters by taking care that they know the Rhine and the Rhone, and the date of Queen Elizabeth, etc., etc.—knowledge on their parts which will reconcile a race of very dignified habits to being beaten by them, no doubt.—I remain, yours very truly,

(Signed) A. De Morgan.

This book itself contains an interesting preface by Professor De Morgan together with a life of Ramchandra. The substance of the book shows great ingenuity in dealing with various problems on the subject.—Yours, etc.,

R. P. Paranjpye.

St. John's College, Cambridge,
December, 1898.

BRITISH INDIANS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

FURTHER PETITION.

TEXT OF THE OFFICIAL NOTICE REGARDING LOCATIONS.

The following petition has been received by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., Chairman of the British Committee of the Indian National Congress:—

S.A. Republic, Johannesburg,
November 28, 1898.

To the Chairman of the
Indian National Congress.

Dear Sir,—We, the undersigned British Indians, residing at Johannesburg in the South African Republic, beg respectfully to draw the attention of your Congress to the following facts:—

1. That by Government Notice No. 621, published in the *Staats Courant* of this Republic, dated November 19, 1898, copy whereof is hereunto annexed, all Indians and other Asiatics are ordered, from and after the first day of January, 1899, to reside and trade only in locations to be pointed out by the Government of this State.

2. We respectfully submit that the terms of the said Government notice are in conflict with the provisions of the "London Convention," which provides that all British subjects, without any distinction, shall have the full right to reside and trade in any part of the South African Republic.

3. That should the provisions of the said Government notice be carried into effect, we will suffer great pecuniary loss, as many of us have established ourselves in business in Johannesburg and elsewhere in this Republic.

We therefore respectfully request your Congress to use its influence on our behalf, with a view to obviating the serious injury that will otherwise be inflicted upon us.

We have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servants, V. A. Chatty, A. Pillay and Co., V. Moorroosamy Modeliar, A. Kestnasamy, A. Appasamy.

The following is a translation of the Government notice referred to above:—

For general information it is hereby notified that the Honourable Executive Council, by resolution of Art. 1101, dated November 15, 1898, has decided—

1. That the Coolies and other Asiatic Natives who do not at present reside and trade in the specified locations, but in conflict with the law, live and trade in a town or village or other prohibited area, shall be ordered by the Landdrost or Mining Commissioner, or, acting on their instructions by the Fieldcornet, to proceed to live and trade in the specified locations before January 1, 1899, in terms of Law 3 of 1885.
2. The Landdrosts and the Mining Commissioners shall, however, prepare two lists of names of these Coolies or other Asiatic Natives who, for a considerable period, have traded in places other than the specified locations, and for whom it would consequently be difficult to remove their businesses within such a short period. On the one list shall be placed the names of Coolies or other Asiatic Natives to whom in the opinion of the Landdrost or Mining Commissioner, at the utmost three months' postponement may be given; and on the second the names of those who may receive six months, thus respectively to April 1 and July 1 of 1899, in which to comply with the law. The Coolies or other Asiatic Natives must themselves ask for such postponement and give reasons therefor.
3. That should application thereanent be made, in order to assist the Coolies and other Asiatic traders, the question of reserving a piece of ground in the location as a bazaar, or for a covered building with shops, will be favourably considered.

In connexion with the above, it is further notified that those Asiatics who consider that they do not fall within the pale of Law 3, 1885, either by virtue of their having entered into an agreement before that date which has not yet expired, or through their having obtained transfer of their property, shall communicate with the Landdrost or Mining Commissioner before January 1 in order that their case may be laid before the Government.

MR. DADABHAI NAOROJI IN LANCASHIRE.

MEETING AT OLDHAM.

The following report is taken from the *Oldham Evening Chronicle* of December 14:—

The first meeting of an educational character in the assembly room of the new Liberal Club in Derker Street was held on Tuesday evening, when Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, an Indian gentleman who during the last Parliament represented Central Finsbury in the House of Commons, addressed a large audience on Indian questions. The chair was occupied by Mr. George Booth, who was supported by Alderman Harrop, Councillor Middleton, Councillor Grime, Messrs. E. Shaw, S. Cheetham and Ivie Mellor, hon. secretaries of the Oldham Liberal Union, under whose auspices the meeting was held.

Mr. Naoroji, who had throughout a most attentive hearing, said the question he had to put before them was whether the British authorities and the British people had done their duty to India? There were two aspects in which he wished to treat this subject—first, as a matter of principle, high policy and duty; and second, as a matter of benefit to the people of this country. On the first and higher consideration he remarked that they had always claimed, and truly claimed, that they stood in the van of civilisation so far as the freedom of the subject was concerned. From his knowledge of the people of this country—a knowledge that extended over 40 years—he was convinced that the British public wished to treat their Indian fellow-subjects fairly and honourably. In 1833 a Reform Bill was passed for India in which was a clause clearly laying down what the policy of the British people ought to be towards the people of India, and the latter desired nothing more than that they should be governed in accordance with the principle then laid down, viz., that the Indian people should be treated exactly like the people of this country. The East India Company, however, gave not the slightest effect to that Act. On the revision of the Company's charter in 1853 Mr. Bright insisted that up to that time the Act of 1833 had been a dead letter, and that something should be definitely laid down as to the way that Act should be carried out. But it was all in vain. After the Mutiny, which was the fault of the British executive in India, the Indian people were agreeably surprised when the Sovereign, in the name of the people, issued a proclamation in which the provisions of the Act of 1833 were renewed with far greater emphasis. No effect was given to that proclamation by the officials. In 1870 partial effect was given to it by the opening up of certain positions in the Indian Civil Service to Natives selected in the country; but even this was utterly ignored by the authorities for years. The British principle that taxation and representation must go together was declined to India. As a proof of this he mentioned that the legislative councils on which Natives sat had the odium of imposing taxation, but had no voice in the spending of the money. It was no secret that the authorities resisted every course by which the Indians would benefit. The declared policy of this country was equality of British and Indian subjects of the Crown and the practical policy of administration was "political hypocrisy" according to Lord Salisbury, and "subterfuge, transparent, and deliberate," according to Lord Lytton. There has been a lot of romancing and high talk about bestowing of blessings on India by British rule, but the actual result had been utter and most miserable impoverishment of the people. For this state of affairs the British public were responsible, and it was the duty of the electors to see that the policy always professed was carried out, and that as Britons said they never would be slaves to see that Britons never made slaves. (Applause.) He wished to tell the people of this country in as plain language as possible that his countrymen were simply British helots, not British subjects. The whole policy of government in India was (to quote Lord Salisbury again) that "India must be bled." British rule, in contrast to Oriental despotism that openly cut men's heads off, had been compared by thoughtful Indians to the skilful operation of the surgeon who cut to the very heart, drew out the blood, and left no wound visible. To the outside world everything was serene and good, there was no oppression, and justice was done between man and man; but under the surface it was pure bleeding. This was the case in relation to the 250 million people under direct British rule, and in contrast to this the people in the Native States (where from prince to lowest official all were Natives) were prosperous and devotedly loyal. What the natives of India asked of the British people was that they should compel the authorities to carry out the policy laid down 65 years ago, and to be true to their word of honour so long since given. British rule was bleeding India to the extent of thirty or forty millions a year in a variety of ways that the ordinary Englishman had no conception of. No land could possibly stand such a drain as that, and sooner or later disaster must come. If they would only look at this Indian question in its proper perspective they would see that it was second to no other political subject before them either in their imperial or their domestic legislation. India was indeed an integral part of the British Empire, but the partnership resembled that in which one man found all the capital and did all the work, whilst the other stayed at home and enjoyed all the profits. If India was administered on truly British principles they would not only strengthen the Empire and benefit India and mankind at large, but they would also benefit this country. This was coming to his second—the lower—level or argument. Up to now British rule had been foolishly and stupidly selfish in regard

to India; what he asked was that it should be intelligently selfish. Mr. Naoroji pointed out that exports from this country to India only averaged eighteenpence per head per annum, whilst to European countries, despite protective tariffs, English exports were many shillings per head per annum, and to Australia the exports were £7 per head per annum. If this country sent to India exports to the value of £1 per head per annum she would be sending out more than she now sent to the whole world; Lancashire would gain the chief benefit, and the word unemployed would be unknown in this district. Mr. Naoroji appealed to his hearers to consider this matter in the two aspects in which he had placed it before them, and to do what they could to form public opinion on that important question of a great nation's need of good government.

Alderman Harrop moved a vote of thanks to Mr. Naoroji, and Councillor Middleton in seconding observed that one branch of the Government's policy was the policy of new markets, but in the case of India they had an old market that wanted making a good one.

The resolution was carried and the meeting then closed with the giving of thanks to the Chairman on the motion of Mr. Charles Leese, seconded by Mr. J. B. Rye.

LORD CURZON AND THE MANCHESTER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

The following correspondence has passed between the Manchester Chamber of Commerce and the new Viceroy of India:—

Manchester Chamber of Commerce,
December 5, 1898.

My Lord,—I am instructed by the board of directors of this Chamber to thank you for your letter of October 5, addressed to the president, Mr. Robert Barclay, and by him communicated to the board.

Whilst regretting that your engagements during the interval before your departure for India are such as to prevent you from receiving a deputation, the Chamber gladly avails itself of your courteous invitation to place before you its views upon some important questions of public policy closely concerning the welfare of the people of India and of British trade with that great country.

The Monetary System of India.—The Chamber is awaiting with deep interest the report and recommendations of the Indian Currency Committee upon the future monetary system of India. It would not be proper that, pending an official enquiry in which opportunity has been given to representatives of the Chamber of presenting evidence, particular reference should be made to the subject in this letter. I am desired, however, on its behalf, to express the earnest hope that whatever action is taken by the Government of India in the settlement of this most important question, it may be such as to preserve and promote the interests of all classes of her Majesty's subjects in India, as well as to place the public finances of the country upon a permanently secure foundation.

The Expenditure of the Indian Government.—The Chamber has long been impressed with the peculiar position of the Indian Government with reference, on the one hand, to the comparatively limited range and fruitfulness of its sources of taxation, and, on the other hand, to the responsibility attaching to it of initiating and supporting productive works, involving often large outlay, which in this country would be readily undertaken by private capitalists. These limits and obligations appear to the Chamber sufficient, apart from other considerations, to call for the exercise of strict economy of expenditure in every department of the administration, Imperial as well as provincial. I am, therefore, respectfully to submit for your lordship's consideration the opinion of the Chamber that amongst the services which your high position in India affords the opportunity of rendering to her Majesty's Indian subjects and to the commerce of the dependency there are few of greater moment than that of steadily insisting upon strict economy with due regard to efficiency in every department, particularly in the sphere of military expenditure. With this object in view, not to speak of others, the Chamber confidently trusts that, while guarding the safety of India, you will do all in your power to prevent political entanglements on the frontiers and elsewhere that may involve unnecessarily increased charge upon the revenues of India.

Irrigation.—The Chamber has for many years observed with interest and satisfaction the efforts of the Indian Government to provide the means of irrigation for lands which are always insufficiently watered by nature, as well as for those which are liable to failure of crops in seasons of scanty rainfall. But notwithstanding the great progress already accomplished in this direction, much yet remains to be done, and the Chamber desires to express to you its earnest hope that this branch of the public service may have particular encouragement, and that irrigation works may, as opportunity occurs, be vigorously pushed forward whenever this can be done with fair expectation of useful results. In particular it is believed that there is an inviting field for enterprise of this kind in Sind, and that funds borrowed by the Government of India may be very profitably invested there in public works for collecting and distributing water for agricultural purposes. In that division the most recent irrigation statistics in the possession of the Chamber show the following results:—

Year.	Capital Outlay to end of Year.	Net Revenue.	Percentage of Net Revenue on Capital Outlay.	Area Irrigated.
	Rx.	Rx.		Acres.
1892-93 ..	1,237,108	146,533	11 8	1,363,660
1893-94 ..	1,293,990	145,466	11·2	1,366,193
1894-95 ..	1,358,654	142,486	10·5	1,449,784
1895-96 ..	1,456,704	97,712	6·7	1,205,038
1896-97 ..	1,627,643	156,626	9·6	i,435,740

It is understood that the return for 1897-98 shows a net revenue equal to 12 per cent., or thereabout.

In view of the high rate of the annual return upon irrigation investment in Sind, of the constant demand for irrigation water in that division, where the crops are almost entirely dependent upon it, as well as of the inexpensive nature of canal construction there, and the abundant supply of water from the Himalayas, the Chamber is encouraged to hope that a larger expenditure of borrowed money in this direction would be profitable to the Government. It would not only be remunerative as an investment, but also as a means of increasing the land revenue and raising the economic *status* of the people.

Railways.—The Chamber has always been a warm and consistent advocate of the opening up of internal communications, and has followed with keen appreciation past efforts to add to the system of railways throughout India. Much has been done in the face of many and various difficulties, but large areas still remain calling for further extension. While in no way desirous of urging on your lordship any proposals that are not in keeping with prudent progress, the Chamber would ask you to lose no opportunity of forwarding the construction, as speedily as is consistent with other considerations, of all lines that after careful investigation give promise of increasing the trade and promoting the welfare of the people. And in this connexion the Chamber desires to express the opinion that it would be wise policy on the part of the Government of India to keep, so far as possible, in its own hands all new important commercial railway developments. The loss on the working of famine and frontier lines is heavy, and it falls on the public revenue of the country. As a counterpoise, the Government may well endeavour to retain possession of the returns on extensions that promise to be immediately profitable. This course would, moreover, obviate the disadvantages of a distant and practically dual control which has in past years been a source of delay, misunderstanding, and frequent administrative inconveniences.

The Chamber desires to express to you its cordial acknowledgment of your valuable services to the Empire in another department during the comparatively short period of your public life, and its confident belief that the responsible duties of Viceroy of India will be discharged by you with zeal and discretion. It is also the earnest hope of the Chamber that your term of service in India may be marked by tranquillity, progress, and prosperity amongst the vast populations committed to your care.

I have the honour to be, my lord, your most obedient servant,
Elijah Helm, Secretary.

Right Hon. Lord Curzon of Kedleston.

22, Sloane Gardens, London, S.W.,
December 10, 1898.

Sir,—Lord Curzon of Kedleston desires me to thank you for your letter of 5th inst., in which you acquaint him with the views of your Chamber on some of the most important of the questions awaiting him in India.

He notes your suggestions as to economy in expenditure, and is in sympathy with the views which you have expressed as to irrigation and railway extension.

In conclusion he wishes me to thank the Chamber for its generous expressions of confidence. The thought that his work is being watched with sympathy by a body possessing the experience and influence of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce will be an encouragement to him in his undertaking.

I have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient servant,
Walter K. Lawrence.

PATHOLOGICAL EXPERIMENTS IN INDIA.

The following Memorial has been sent to Lord Curzon of Kedleston:—

To his Excellency the Right Honourable Lord Curzon, Viceroy and Governor-General Designate of India.

The Memorial of the Committee of the Personal Rights Association respectfully sheweth that—

Your Memorialists are the Executive Committee of an association formed nearly twenty-eight years ago for maintaining the rights of person which are threatened on all hands by modern legislation and modern conceptions of the function of the State.

Your Memorialists and their predecessors have endeavoured to fulfil this duty, within the limits of their legitimate powers, quietly and unostentatiously, seeking rather to attain their ends by convincing the higher minds, than by entering the ordinary political arena.

In this spirit, Your Memorialists approach Your Excellency, and respectfully beseech the attention of Your Excellency on a matter directly of great importance to their Indian fellow-subjects, indirectly of great importance to the people of the United Kingdom, and to humanity at large.

Your Memorialists have learnt with great regret that it is the intention of the Native Princes and Chiefs of India, in response to suggestions made from this country, which they may not consider themselves free to disregard, to set up an "Indian Princes' Victoria Health Institute," which will be largely conducted on vivisectional and Pasteurian methods.

Your Memorialists would rejoice that the Native Rulers of India, and the people of India, should spontaneously celebrate the Jubilee of Her Majesty by some humane and useful work in consonance with their own moral sentiments; but your Memorialists venture to think that Your Excellency will agree with them that if the Native Rulers of India feel themselves coerced into violation of their deep-seated moral scruples, and those of the people of India, by being made the unwilling tools of a system of torture of the lower animals and transmission of their diseases to human beings, this is not the sort of Memorial of Her Majesty's Jubilee which any wise and loyal subjects of Her Majesty would desire to see brought into existence.

Your Memorialists are very much impressed by the fact that such violence as is proposed to be done to the ethical emotions of the Indian people might, and probably would, do a moral mischief to those people far transcending the medical and scientific worth of the institution in question, even if taken at the exorbitant valuation of its promoters. It is very much easier to destroy the basis of the moral sentiments of a people than to provide a new one; and even if the Pasteurian and vivisectional methods had much higher credentials than they have, Your Memorialists would still urge that it would be a most unwise, unpolitic, and unjustifiable thing to force on the teeming millions of India who are subject to British rule a method of dealing with disease which is still *sub judice*, and which is abhorrent to the Indian conscience.

Your Memorialists, therefore, humbly pray Your Excellency to take such steps as may be necessary to set free the conscience of India in this matter, and thus save the people of the United Kingdom from responsibility for what would be a cruel and unjustifiable use of their power.

CHARLES H. HOPWOOD, Chairman.
M. E. H. COLSON, Assistant-Secretary.

26th November, 1898.

The following reply has been received from Lord Curzon:—

India Office, Whitehall, S.W.,
December 3, 1898.

Madam,—I have to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 26th ult. and of the Memorial of the Committee of the Personal Rights Association, which accompanied it, on the subject of the proposed Health Institute in India.

I have received many other communications of a similar nature and have undertaken to give my attention to the subject after my arrival in India. I have said in previous replies that all efforts to guard against the infliction of avoidable pain in the course of scientific investigation will have my fullest sympathy; but that I prefer to wait till I have arrived in the country and have studied the question on the spot before pronouncing a final opinion upon a matter which cannot be exclusively decided on general grounds.

I am, Madam, yours faithfully,
CURZON OF KEDLESTON.

Miss M. E. H. Colson,
Asst. Secretary of the Personal Rights Association.

ET CAETERA.

Sir Alfred Milner, Governor and High Commissioner for South Africa, paid a long visit to the Colonial Office on Saturday. His Excellency will remain in England for another month, and will sail for the Cape to resume his duties on January 28 next.

The Postmaster-General gives notice that, on and after Christmas Day, the postage to be prepaid on letters from the United Kingdom for the undermentioned British possessions and Protectorates will be 1d. per ½ oz., instead of 2½d. as at present:—Aden, Ascension, Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Central Africa, British East Africa, British Guiana, British Honduras, Canada, Ceylon, Cyprus, Falkland Islands, Fiji Islands, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gold Coast Colony, Hong-Kong, India, Johore, Lagos; Leeward Islands, viz.:—Antigua, St. Kitts, Nevis, Dominica, Montserrat, and the Virgin Islands; Malay States (federated), viz.:—Perak, Selangor, Negri-Sembilan, and Pahang; Natal, Newfoundland, Niger Coast Protectorate, Niger territory, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Straits Settlements, Tobago, Trinidad, Turks Islands, Uganda; Windward Islands, viz.:—Grenada, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent.

Mr. Rawlinson, Q.C., who has been appointed Recorder of Cambridge in the place of Mr. Bulwer, Q.C., was created a Queen's Counsel only about a year ago. He appeared as junior counsel for the Treasury in the prosecution of Dr. Jameson, and went out to South Africa for the purpose of preparing the evidence against the leaders of the Raid. Among the cases in which he has appeared at Cambridge is the famous Spinning-house case, in which he represented the University. He is the youngest son of Sir Christopher Rawlinson, late Chief Justice of Madras, and is thirty-eight years of age. He was educated at Eton and Cambridge, and was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1884. He is one of the few eminent lawyers who continue to have residential chambers in the Temple.

Mr. Labouchere, in an appreciative note on the late Lord Napier and Ettrick, one of whose secretaries he was when that nobleman was British Ambassador in St. Petersburg, relates the following story in *Truth*:—Prince Gortchakoff, the Russian Chancellor, asked Lord Napier to communicate some information to his Government. This he promised to do. "But how are you going to send it?" asked the Chancellor. Lord Napier had an inkling that the Russian Foreign Office was already able to read his cipher, so he said: "I will send it by telegraph." Prince Gortchakoff on this began to fidget, and said, "I do not wish my colleagues to know what I am communicating to you." "Certainly," replied Lord Napier; "but you have nothing to fear, as I will send it in my cipher." Still more did the Prince fidget. At last he said, "We are old friends, and we understand the necessities of diplomacy. The truth is that we can decipher the code that you usually use." On this Lord Napier promised to send it by messenger; the fact being that codes used by diplomatists were deciphered at the Ministry of the Interior, and it was precisely the Minister of the Interior who was not to know that the information had been given. This is how it was done. Whenever a Foreign Representative received a telegram in cipher from his Government a copy of it was taken at the Ministry of the Interior. If the Representative receiving the telegram communicated to the Minister of Foreign Affairs anything a day or two later, this, too, was sent to the Ministry of the Interior. The communication and the telegram were then compared. Supposing the cipher to be a series of numbers, as is usual, a few words would thus be made out. The clues thus obtained would increase according to the frequency of the telegrams received, and in a very short time it would be possible to read the whole cipher.

For a round century (says the *New Age*) we have ruled India exactly as we chose; and now, more than at any other period since the issue of the Bengal Regulations, our officials are struggling to restrict the free and natural development of the people. "Associate them with us in the task of working out for themselves a higher and a better political and social ideal"! Could there be a more bitter sarcasm uttered than this? We have educated the Natives diligently: there is none that officialism more derides and discourages than an educated Native. He is a blithering "Babu," if he is not a "damned nigger." He is not to be associated in anything, but to be suppressed in everything. Follow the Indian to our colonies, and see how he is treated there. Why, in a like manner of superiority, he is put under laws of exclusion and restriction. Australia, New South Wales and Western Australia have applied to him the same repressive legislation as they apply to the Chinese; and Victoria is legislating in a like sense, not for any reason of her own, but simply to work hand-in-hand with the sister colonies.

PUBLIC MEETINGS ON INDIAN QUESTIONS.

THE WORK OF THE BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Among meetings arranged for the New Year may be mentioned a further series of four meetings in Lancashire to be addressed by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on January 16, 17, 18, and 19.

Mr. Bipin Chandra Pal will address a meeting at Ealing on January 9.

Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E., will address a meeting at the Lewisham and Lee Liberal and Radical Club on January 29.

Elsewhere in the present issue of INDIA will be found a report of the meeting at Oldham addressed by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji on December 13. Commenting on this meeting, the *Oldham Evening Chronicle* writes:—

Quite recently several Indian gentlemen have been trying to rouse public opinion in Lancashire in support of their claim for the redress of crying grievances that have resulted in impoverishment and starvation in our great Eastern dependency. That the work of these champions of the cause of their distressed compatriots is having an effect on the popular mind here is certain, and the people of this land are indebted to them for the eye-opening revelations they are making respecting the arbitrary officialism which is continually bleeding India. Mr. Naoroji, who spoke in St. James's Hall, Derker Street, on Tuesday evening, has, we understand, had business relations with this town for over a quarter of a century.

JUST PUBLISHED.

With Maps, Plans, Portraits, and Illustrations, 8vo, 8/6 net.

THE CAMPAIGN IN TIRAH 1897-98.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE EXPEDITION AGAINST THE ORAKZAIS AND AFRIDIS UNDER GENERAL SIR WILLIAM LOCKHART, G.C.B., K.C.S.I.

Based (by permission) on Letters contributed to the TIMES,

By COLONEL H. D. HUTCHINSON,
Director of Military Education in India.

DAILY CHRONICLE.—"We are not sure that his very carefully compiled and very well written work will not ultimately rank as the best account of this our finest instance of mountain warfare. . . . . Must be a real pleasure to all students of military history."

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED, LONDON.

JUST PUBLISHED. Crown 8vo, 5s.

RÂMAKRISHNA: HIS LIFE AND SAYINGS.

BY THE RIGHT HON. F. MAX MÜLLER, K.M.,
Foreign Member of the French Institute; Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford.

*** *Râmakrishna, whose life is described and whose sayings have been collected in this volume, was one of those Indian ascetics and sages who are known under different names, as Sannyâsins, Mahâtmans, or Yogins. He was born in 1833, and died in 1886.*

LONDON: LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.

BOURNEMOUTH: Invalids and others RETURNING FROM INDIA may find comfortable Lodgings and Attendance (with good cooking) at "Debonnaire," Boscombe. References kindly permitted, amongst others, to Captain Hartley, J.P., Bournemouth; and to J. Cannington, Esq., Marine Square, Brighton. Address, Mr. D. F. de Souza, 31, Knole Road, Bournemouth, East.

LONDON INDIAN SOCIETY.

DADABHAI NAOROJI, ESQ., PRESIDENT.

Above Society on receipt of 5 anna stamps will give information regarding course of study and cost of living in England. Gentlemen will be met at London, Edinburgh, Oxford, or Cambridge stations on giving fortnight's notice.

Apply, Dr. MULLICK,

SOHO SQUARE, NATIONAL HOSPITAL, LONDON, W.

NOW READY.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence, net. In India, 1 Rupee.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 2.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

EVIDENCE-IN-CHIEF OF THE FIVE INDIAN WITNESSES.

Large foolscap, 116 pp.

Published by the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

This Volume may be also obtained from the Secretaries of the Standing Congress Committees at Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras. Remittances should accompany application.

N.B.—The postage of each copy is 4d., in addition to the price stated above.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

BUNTER'S NERVINE

Prevents Decay, Saves Extraction. Sleepless Nights Prevented.

Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTER'S NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s-1½d.

---

is what its name implies **FEVER DESTROYER,**

and Cures Malarious, Intermittent and Remittent types of Fevers, Colds, etc.

North Raglan Barracks, Devonport.
I beg to enclose a cheque for the "Jvara-Hari." Both in India and Africa I have found it the BEST REMEDY FOR FEVER know
C. E. WOOD, Capt. 22nd North Staffs. Regt.

"Jvara-Hari" is so efficacious on all fevers, that I now indent upon you for 4 dozen, per value payable parcel. I think there is more than magic in it.
G. L. NARSINGA ROW.

For INDIGESTION, DIARRHŒA, CHOLERA, etc., etc.

Cuddalore Municipal Councillors' Office.—"I have much pleasure in stating that your "Omum-Carpoor" was found very useful for Cholera if taken in the early stage,
C. S. SRINIVASA, Chairman.

Omum-Carpoor
TRADE MARK

Prices of "JVARA-HARI" and "OMUM-CARPOOR" 8 ans., 1 Rs., 1/8 Rs., 2/12 Rs., and 11 Rs. per bottle. N.B.—1 doz. sent post free. To be had of all Chemists and Dealers, or of the Proprietors,

HENRY'S GREAT INDIAN REMEDIES COMPANY, 43, King William St., London, E.C., and 27, Second Line Beach, Madras.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

**THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.**

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER of INDIA, 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.